

POPSF  
11.3.31.5.1

Childs, John

**From:** Hermans, Marcel  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2001 7:58 AM  
**To:** Childs, John  
**Cc:** Degens, Sebastian; Quinn, Padraic (Pad)  
**Subject:** Comments for HC letter and report

**Importance:** High

My comments on the HC-letter:

I think we shouldn't have HartCrowser tell the Port of Portland what the results are from parts of the program that Port of Portland performed without involvement from HC. It looks to me as a weird construction for reporting those monitoring efforts. Therefore this letter shouldn't go into detail about the results of visual monitoring.

My comments on the draft report about elutriate testing.

- ✕ Last sentence of the "Dear Mr. Childs" paragraph better start with something like "We therefore consider the MET an useful and reliable test for (...)"
- ✓ 6th line of introduction paragraph should read "(...) material elutriate that could be discharged over the weir at the rehandling facility and back to (...)"
- ✓ page 2, under turbidity, on 4th line:  
Change into "One day " of settling is the duration of time since the discharge of run-off water from the dredged material into the separate holding basin of the rehandling (...)"
- ✓ Conclusions (page 4), first bullet:  
It should be clearly stated that the Lab. test for a 1-day settling leads to an overly conservative result because of the tiered settling process by use of the 2 separate basins !  
[The 1-day refers to the settling of the water that has been collected in the secondary basin and held without further discharge of additional run-off water from the primary basin for 1 day. Actual settling took place beforehand in the primary basin (could be several days), and also immediately after the primary weir was opened until it was closed (could be 1 or 2 days); that's the moment when the clock starts ticking for the 1 day. ]

Let me know if you've got any questions about this !

Thanks,

Marcel

